SUBJECTS.

Stamp paper and fees would not be accepted until the original records of which copies were asked for were found; and those would not be found unless the petty subordinates of the branch were satisfied by the parties. If the parties did not dance attendance on them, the application stood the chance of being rejected after seven days. It should therefore be ruled that the originals should be found within seven days at the latest and the application for copies should not be rejected until after seven days from the date on which the originals were found. The Member said that the copying branch required the closest attention and stringent instructions. There were too many copyists in the Courts at present. He also said that proper men were not being appointed as commissioners, and he suggested that respectable clerks, who had some knowledge of survey, be appointed as commissioners and that they be directed to frame their reports in consultation with the respectable gentry of the locality.

Dewan's reply.—The representations of the Members will be communicated to the High Court.

46. The desirability of re-transferring the pakuthies of Veliyam and Velinallur from the jurisdiction of the Quilon to that of the Kottarakara Munsiff.

Mr. Devan Govindan (Member, Kottarakara taluk) said that the *pakuthies* of Veliyam and Velinallur had been within the jurisdiction of the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court, but that, in the recent re-adjustment of the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts, they were brought under the jurisdiction of the Quilon Munsiff's Court. The distances from the centres of those *pakuthies* to the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court were about 5 and 7 miles respectively, while the corresponding distances to the Quilon Munsiff's Court were 19 and 21 miles. The people of the two *pakuthies* had now to get to Kottarakara first and thence take train to Quilon. The magisterial, registration and revenue jurisdictions of the *pakuthies* were with the offices at Kottarakara. The Member therefore prayed that the civil jurisdiction of the two *pakuthies* might be re-transferred to the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

47. The need for re-establishing a Munsiff's Court at Shencotta.

Mr. G Sankaranarayana Iyer (Member, T. I. C., Shencotta) said that the frontier taluk of Shencotta had a Munsiff's Court between 1010 and 1087 M. E. From 1010 to 1043 the Tahsildar-Magistrate was doing the duties of the Munsiff, from 1043 to 1072 there was a full-time Munsiff, and from 1072 to 1082 the old arrangement of the Tahsildar-Magistrate being also the Munsiff was revived. On the representation of the people, the arrangement was cancelled and a Magistrate-Munsiff was appointed in 1082, and it continued till 1087. The last arrangement worked very satisfactorily and was also economical to the Government. The Court was at present abolished and the people of Shencotta had to go to Kottarakara. The volume of inconvenience the altered arrangement caused to the Shencotta public would be seen on an examination of the number of suits of different kinds and execution petitions from Shencotta on the Kottarakara Munsiff's file. The people from the interior villages of the taluk had now to walk or come in carts for several miles, take train at Shencotta and go to Kottarakara. In several suits for small amounts, the inconvenience in going to the Court, coupled with the risk of losing the cases ultimately, made the people rest content in their houses. He requested that all the above facts might

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

receive the kind consideration of the Government and he prayed that either a full-time Munsiff, with jurisdiction over the villages of Pathanapuram lying four or five miles of the Shencotta Railway Station, or at least a Magistrate-Munsiff as before, might be allowed for the taluk.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

48. The desirability of transferring the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court to Kayankulam.

Mr. A. Krishna Pillai (Member, Trading Classes, Kayankulam) said that it did not require much argument from him to show that Kayankulam was one of the important trading centres of the State. Now it had all the important public offices except a Munsiff's Court. In that respect the people of the town were suffering much inconvenience all along, as they had to go to Krishnapuram for civil remedies. In the recent re-adjustment of the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts a portion of the jurisdiction of the Krishnapuram Munsiff was transferred to the newly constituted Court at Karunagappalli. With the above re-adjustment there would be no more necessity for retaining the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court there, and the long felt want of Kayankulam would be satisfied by shifting the Court a little more to the north and establishing it at Kayankulam. There could be no inconvenience to the Government on account of a building, for, the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court was all along housed in a rented building. If the Kayankulam Sub-Registrar's office be removed to a rented building, the satrom at Kayankulam would become available for locating the Munsiff's Court; and when a pucka building was constructed at Kayankulam, all the Government offices could conveniently go into it.

Dewan's reply.—The High Court will be asked to report on the subject.

49. The desirability of transferring the Alleppey Additional Munsiff's Court to Ampalapuzha.

Mr. S. Parameswara Menon (Member, Ampalapuzha taluk) said that there was a Munsiff's Court at Ampalapuzha which was transferred to Alleppey in 1057 M. E. Now there were two Courts at Alleppey, at the north-western extremity of the taluk. The people of Purakkad and Thalavadi had to travel a distance of 17 and 18 miles respectively to go to Alleppey. Ampalapuzha had at present all the other institutions except a Munsiff's Court. The subject had been brought forward at three previous sessions of the Assembly. The Member therefore prayed that the Additional Court at Alleppey be transferred to Ampalapuzha. He added that there was no permanent building at present for the Alleppey Court, so that the Government had nothing to lose that way.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

50. The need for a Munsiff's Court, at Changanacherry.

Mr. P. J. Oommen (Member, Changanacherry taluk) said that there was, at one time, a Munsiff's Court at Changanacherry, which was shifted in 1030 to Ampalapuzha. The civil jurisdiction of the taluk now rested partly with the Thiruvalla and partly with the Alleppey Munsiffs' Courts. The taluk still preserved its unity in matters of revenue, magisterial and registration jurisdictions. By the establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Changanacherry, the Additional Court at Thiruvalla might be abolished and the Court at

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly